Before the Federal Communications Commission Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of)	
)	
Notice	of	Proposed	Rulemaking	entitled)	WC Docket No. 17-108
Restoring Internet Freedom)	
)	

REPLY COMMENTS OF ANTHONY JONES

I am Anthony Jones, an amateur radio operator (callsign KC9PKE) and soon to be the database administrator of a small software-as-a-service firm based in the state of Florida. Fot the better half of my life, I have been immensely fascinated by communications technology of many shapes and forms, and more recently, began to delve into the world of telecom law developments. While most of my time spent analyzing these developments have been no more than a hobby, I am filing these comments today as the aforementioned Notice of Proposed Rulemaking may have far-reaching, adverse implications on the consumer technology industry. These policy changes and their effects on the market may affect myself and other laypeople, and I feel it is important to express my concerns here.

INTRODUCTION

On April 27. 2017, the FCC released a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking entitled Restoring Internet Freedom, where FCC Chairman Ajit Pai proposes "to end the utility-style regulatory approach that gives government control of the Internet and to restore the market-based policies necessary to preserve the future of Internet Freedom, and to reverse the decline in infrastructure investment, innovation, and options for consumers put into motion by the FCC in 2015."

PROPOSED CHANGES ARE GENERALLY UNPOPULAR FROM CONSUMER P/O/V

Around the time of the adoption of the Open Internet Order the FCC saw what was observed to be a flood of comments filed in support of the Order. Many parties supporting the order aired their grievances regarding these rules as they would have effectively allowed anyone operating an IP network, be it a mobile network operator, multiple system operator, or incumbent/competitive local exchange carrier to selectively and arbitrarily impair or completely block the use of specific applications and services on their networks. Americans have historically enjoyed access to IP services granted to them on a best-effort basis and this expectation of the average consumer is not expected to change any time soon. The only true support of this NPRM is coming from MNOs, MSOs, and ILECs seeking out relief from what only they believe to be burdensome regulation,

NPRM IS DECEPTIVE OVERALL

The title of the NPRM, Restoring Internet Freedom, is misleading to the layperson, Many people, even some on the seats of Congress, have admitted to not thoroughly reading a proposed law or policy before deciding their opinion or even voting on it. It may be fair to assume a neophyte who has only heard of this NPRM via word of mouth to and may view it as favorable while knowing nothing more than its title. Furthermore, it is claimed in the NPRM that investment in infrastructure has declined since the adoption of the Open Internet Order—this is demonstrably false. Recently, the FCC concluded an auction of 70 MHz of spectrum intended to be used for new cellular networks. One of the largest bidders, T-Mobile US, came out of the auction winning at least 20 MHz of spectrum in every corner of the United States and also Puerto Rico. Since 2015, T-Mobile has also been busy deploying LTE in various rural and urban areas in the country, and continues to grow at a steady pace. Moreover, all 4 of the major mobile network operators have recently reintroduced unlimited data plans in some form after recognizing that their subscribers are not satisfied with small, arbitrary data caps. Notwithstanding mobile network operators, investment in wireline networks is also being seen—for example, multiple system operator Comcast plans to launch gigabit over their HFC network within the couple upcoming years.

CONCLUSION

In summary, with all of the information I know to be true, I believe that only large ISPs would benefit from the adoption of this NPRM. I urge the Commission to strongly reconsider adopting this NPRM.

Respectfully submitted, Anthony Jones